



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,979	12/07/2001	David J. Carini	PH7262 NP	5592
23914	7590	11/19/2003	EXAMINER	
STEPHEN B. DAVIS			KIFLE, BRUCK	
BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY				
PATENT DEPARTMENT				
P O BOX 4000			1624	
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000			DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003	
10				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/010,979	CARINI, DAVID J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 and 5.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of the species shown in Example 1 in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged. The search was expanded to embrace the entire scope of the compound of formula (I), pharmaceutical composition and method of use.

Note that compounds, corresponding compositions, a method of use and a process of making that are of the same scope are considered to form a single inventive concept. Claims 39, 48, 49 and 59 are not so linked as to form a single inventive concept. Claim 39 includes a cystostatic or cytotoxic agent and claim 59 is drawn to a kit. These claims are drawn to patentably distinct and independent inventions and raise different issues of patentability.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "prodrug" renders the claims indefinite because one skilled in the art cannot say which prodrug is intended.

Claims 40-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 40-43 are drawn in part to the treatment of cancer. The specification does not provide enablement for the treatment of cancer generally. No compound has ever been found that can treat cancers generally even though massive efforts have been directed towards this end.

Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in oncology, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. Nearly all anticancer drugs are effective against only a limited group of related cancers. Therefore, a compound effective against cancer generally would be a revolutionary exception. Applicant is asserting that he succeeded where others have failed.

Where extensive efforts have all failed, it is reasonable for the Patent and Trademark Office to require proof that the claimed invention actually works for this specific utility. It is well established that a utility rejection is proper when scope of enablement is not reasonably correlated to the scope of the claims. (In re Vaeck 20 USPQ2d 1439, 1444, In re Ferens 163 USPQ 609).

In re Buting 163 USPQ 689 establishes that even clinical tests showing that a compound found to be useful in the treatment of two types of cancers was not sufficient for a much broader range.

Regarding the treatment of “autoimmune diseases” generally. This would be an unprecedented feat. For a compound or genus to be effective against “autoimmune diseases” generally is contrary to medical science. The “autoimmune diseases” are a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There are hundreds of such diseases, which have fundamentally different mechanisms and different underlying causes. There are both chronic and acute “autoimmune diseases”, most of which lack satisfactory treatment. The intractability of these disorders is clear evidence that the skill level in this art is low relative to the difficulty of the task. Under such circumstances, it is proper for the PTO to require evidence that such an unprecedented feat has actually been accomplished, In re Ferens, 163 USPQ 609. No such evidence has been presented in this case. The failure of

skilled scientists to achieve a goal is substantial evidence that achieving such a goal is beyond the skill of practitioners in that art, *Genentech vs Novo Nordisk*, 42 USPQ2nd 1001, 1006.

Similarly, there is no such thing as a broad spectrum anti-viral agent.

Regarding claims 50-58 drawn to inhibiting CDK1-CDK9 activities, these claims would read on CDK activity inhibition in patients with below normal CDK activity, CDK activity inhibition in patients with CDK activity, or in asymptomatic patients with up-regulated CDK activity. The specification fails to teach any benefit to be gained from such actions. Is extensive experimentation required on the part of a potential infringer to determine if his use of Applicants' inhibitor falls within the limitations of applicants' claim? *In re Kirk and Petrow*, 153 USPQ 48 (CCPA 1967). As the Supreme Court said in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 USPQ at 696: "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion." As U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals stated *In re Diedrich* 138 USPQ at 130, quoting with approval from the decision of the board: "We do not believe that it was the intention of the statutes to require the Patent Office, the courts, or the public to play the sort of guessing game that might be involved if an applicant could satisfy the requirements of the statutes by indicating the usefulness of a claimed compound in terms of possible use so general as to be meaningless and then, after his research or that of his competitors has definitely ascertained an actual use for the compound, adducing evidence intended to show that a particular specific use would have been obvious to men skilled in the particular art to which this use relates."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nugiel et al. (WO 99/54308). The reference teaches a generic group of structurally similar compounds which embraces applicants' claimed compounds (See pages 5-17, compounds of formula (I) and definitions of the variables). The claims differ from the reference by reciting specific species and a more limited genus than the reference. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select any of the species of the genus taught by the reference, including those instantly claimed, because the skilled chemist would have the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render *prima facie* obvious a species falling within a genus. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 847 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-57 of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,103 and as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,593,356. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are embraced by the patented claims. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the references since such compounds would have been suggested by the patented claims.

Application 10/000,820 is not available to determine whether there is any double patenting between it and the instant application. Applicants are requested to present a copy of the allowed claims in response to this office action.

Art Unit: 1624

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruck Kifle, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 703-305-4484. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund J. Shah can be reached on 703-308-4716. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.



Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

BK

November 14, 2003